

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 16-18, 24-26, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Cavalcanti et al., *A Logic Based Approach for Automatic Synthesis and Maintenance of Web Sites*, SEKE 2002, July 15-19, 2002, ACM ("Cavalcanti"); rejected claims 19 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavalcanti in view of Weinberger et al., *Computers in Radiology: MyPACS.net: A Web-Based Teaching File Authoring Tool*, The American Journal of Roentgenology, Issue 179, September 2002 ("Weinberger"); and objected to claims 20-23, 28-31, and 33-35 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections in the Final Office Action. However, to advance prosecution of this case, Applicant hereby amends independent claims 16, 24, and 32 to incorporate the allowed subject matter of dependent claims 20, 28, and 33, respectively. Accordingly, claims 20, 28, and 33 have been cancelled, and dependent claims 21-23, 27-31, 34, and 35 have been amended to maintain proper antecedent bases. Therefore, pending claims 16-19, 21-27, 29-32, 34, and 35 are allowable over the art of record, including Cavalcanti and Weinberger. Applicant, therefore, requests that the Examiner withdraw all of the rejections.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 16-19, 21-27, 29-32, 34, and 35 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed claim amendments do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, because all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicant further submits that the entry of the amendments would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 28, 2006

By: Anthony Z. L. Reg. No. 53,332
for C. Gregory Gramenopoulos
Reg. No. 36,532